**“我们应当要注意几个国家的前车之鉴，这些国家的劳动群众由于共产党执行了错误的路线而遭到沉重打击”**

**--印度共产党(毛主义)中央委员会发言人阿扎德（Azad）同志谈论尼泊尔现阶段事态的发展。**

**《人民进行曲》第7卷第6、7期，2006月6-7月**

**来源：<https://icspwindia.wordpress.com/（支持印度人民战争网）印共毛成立十周年纪念册>，英文原版在中文版结尾后。**

**翻译：Telegram 人民战争-中文广播频道**

**【随着尼泊尔的最新事态发展和尼泊尔共产党(毛主义)提出的战术和战略，以及印度“马克思主义者”和修正主义者不断呼吁印度毛派向尼泊尔毛派学习，《人民进行曲》杂志一直试图获得印共（毛）的回应。最后，我们通过电子邮件收到了印度共产党(毛主义)发言人的回复，这在很大程度上给出了他们的回应。以下是我们的记者在2006年6月底对印度共产党（毛主义）中央委员会发言人阿扎德同志的采访。】**

***提问1：您如何看待尼泊尔目前的事态发展？***

**阿扎德：我们印度人民一直以极大的兴趣关注着尼泊尔当前的事态发展。在强大的武装斗争背景下，尼泊尔人民在4月对贾南德拉国王的反动专制政权进行了激进的群众斗争，这的确是历史性的。尼泊尔人民迫使法西斯国王放弃其顽固立场，向议会让出权力，从而在尼泊尔的历史上写下了光辉的篇章。我们党赞扬尼泊尔人民为争取民主和更好的社会而进行的历史性斗争。然而，印度的革命者们一直期望尼泊尔的斗争能够持续下去，直到革命和民主力量推翻国王并夺取政权。我们更希望看到纳拉扬希提宫（Narayanhitti）被围攻，以及它被人民攻陷的情景。我们希望尼泊尔毛派能从七党联盟手中夺回主动权，因为七党联盟想与国王达成妥协，背叛了人民的愿望。这似乎是有可能的，但事情的结果并非如此。我们可以说，人民的愿望已经得到了部分满足。**

***提问2：您如何看待尼泊尔共产党(毛主义)加入临时政府并承诺遵守制宪会议裁决的策略？***

**阿扎德：尼泊尔和世界的局势是错综复杂的。由于国际共产主义运动的萎靡，我们看到许多人民战争运动在几十年的生存斗争中陷入了困境，在这种形势下，尼泊尔党和人民无疑取得了历史性的进步，但我们觉得有必要谨慎对待目前的策略。我们认为，毛派与反动的尼泊尔大会党（Nepali Congress）、修正主义的尼泊尔共产党（联合马列）【CPN-UML】等资产阶级-封建主义政党组成联合政府，对革命事业非但没有帮助，反而有害。认为可以从内部和平地改革国家而不打碎它的想法本身就违背了我们的马克思主义导师关于国家和革命的基本原理。一些自上而下的改革，可以满足某些被剥夺权利的人群，但这永远解决不了人民的根本问题，因为你不可能利用旧的国家来粉碎封建主义，并将帝国主义从尼泊尔的土地上赶走，无论你如何修饰，给它一个翻新的形象。只有群众的革命起义才能达到上述目的。**

**尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）目前的立场无疑是令人惊讶的，因为他们出色地建立了大约25000人的人民军队、根据地、联合战线和新的权力机构，并声称他们正处于夺取政权的战略进攻阶段。在这一过程中，他们有效地挫败了警察和尼泊尔皇家军队（Royal Nepalese Army，简称RNA）镇压他们的一切努力，保持了军事和政治上的主动。但现在他们甚至没有提到战略进攻和如何推进战略攻势。**

**至于尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）的立场，即制宪会议赞成君主立宪制，党将服从制宪会议的裁决。我们认为这只意味着跟在群众后面，放弃了提高群众意识和领导群众的革命责任。**

***提问3：您如何看待革命政权机构的解散和两军合并？***

**阿扎德：这些机构是持久人民战争中反对旧政权的产物，是尼共(毛)党在地方建立人民民主专政的光辉典范。当前的任务和策略应该是加强这些机构，把它们塑造成像革命的俄国和中国的苏维埃那样的起义机构。在巩固这些权力机关的同时，我们必须努力大规模地动员群众起义，争取占领城市，争取在适当的时候最终夺取政权。事实上，在今天尼泊尔的具体形势下，毛派实际上只有两种革命选择。要么他们必须加强群众运动，发展适合在尼泊尔全国范围内夺取政权的政治组织形式，如果由于阶级力量的不平衡而无法做到这一点，则应巩固和加强现有的基础根据地，并采取措施完成民主任务，继续朝着社会主义的方向前进。在这个过程中，可能会出现两个尼泊尔--一个是以加德满都和少数城市为中心的反动的尼泊尔，一个是以农村为中心的革命的尼泊尔。解散这些机构意味着牺牲工人阶级和劳苦大众的基本阶级利益，而不是采取两种革命选择中的一种。**

**至于将人民军队并入重组后的国家军队，则更加危险。毛泽东说：“没有一个人民的军队，便没有人民的一切”，军队是阶级统治的主要工具之一。两个截然相反的阶级怎么可能会拥有同一支军队呢？通过将人民军队与统治阶级的反动军队(至今仍是国王的忠实仆人)合并，尼泊尔毛派的做法进一步危害了人民的利益。如果敌人发起反动武装进攻，人民将变得毫无防备。我们应当要注意几个国家的前车之鉴，这些国家的劳动群众由于共产党执行了错误的路线而遭到沉重打击。在印度尼西亚，统治阶级与他们认为是民族主义和民主力量的势力相勾结，对共产党员及其同情者进行了残酷的屠杀。我们面前还有智利、尼加拉瓜和其他几个国家的例子。我们不能排除反动统治阶级在革命力量被有效解除武装或被削弱的时候发动政变，重新建立垄断独裁政权的可能性，这是二战后法国、希腊等几个国家的前车之鉴。当然，如果毛主义者不对帝国主义和买办官僚资产阶级（CBB）的利益构成威胁，并且他们被容纳和融入体制，那么他们也会被统治阶级的糖衣炮弹热情地接待。邀请联合国监督停火和监督人民武装力量的遣散是非常危险的，联合国本质上是帝国主义特别是美帝国主义的工具，它必然会为尼泊尔的反动统治阶级和帝国主义的利益服务。总体而言，尼泊尔共产党(毛主义)决定解散农村的革命人民政”，并将党的人民解放军与反动军队合并，这将是一个不可逆转的过程，使迄今取得的一切革命成果付诸东流。**

***提问4：印度的各个议会政党，更不用说像印度共产党（CPI）和印度共产党（马克思主义）【CPI(M)】这样的“左翼政党”，一直在为尼泊尔毛派参与临时政府和议会民主路线叫好，并表示这将对印度的毛主义运动产生积极影响。贵党如何评估其影响？***

**阿扎德：印度的这些政党一厢情愿地认为，尼泊尔的事态发展将对我国的毛主义运动产生 "积极 "的影响(他们所说的“积极”是指毛主义者避开武装斗争，加入所谓的议会政治主流)。任何熟悉印度毛主义运动历史的人都知道，在纳萨尔巴里起义之后的四十年里，经过无数的起伏，我们的运动仍旧顽强。印度真正的毛主义者，即使面对巨大的困难和对革命者不利的因素时，也没有动摇和偏离过他们的新民主主义革命路线，并通过持久人民战争路线来实现它。他们不仅拒绝议会道路，而且还与那些想以“革命策略”为名利用议会参加选举的政党进行斗争。当然，也有一些伪革命政党，比如印度共产党（马列）解放派 【CPI（ML）-Liberation】，它们已经堕落为议会党，但这些披着马列毛主义幌子的修正主义政党已经暴露在了人民面前。**

**难怪印度各统治阶级政党和所谓的左翼政党对普拉昌达领导的尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）改变立场而感到高兴。他们自然对尼共（毛）采取的路线欢呼雀跃，并呼吁印度的毛主义者认识到武装斗争的无用性，跟随尼泊尔的毛派参加印度的议会猪圈。作为革命的死敌和反对者，所有这些政党都站在了镇压印度正在进行的人民战争的最前线。尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）决定与反动党派一起参加新政府，宣布他们对所谓的法治和未来宪法的承诺，并在制宪会议选举后成为议会选举游戏的参与者，这对尼泊尔的统治阶级政党和印度的议会制度来说是一个喘息的机会。**

**事实上，普拉昌达在去年二月接受《印度教徒报》采访时曾暗示，他的多党民主路线将对印度毛主义运动产生“积极”影响。听到普拉昌达谈到他的政党对多党民主的承诺，以及他希望通过在尼泊尔成功建立多党民主来向印度纳萨尔派运动传达的信息，印度统治阶级一定松了一口气。**

**当被问及如果他见到印度总理曼莫汉-辛格（Manmohan Singh）会说什么时，普拉昌达说：**

**“我们正在为真正的多党民主而战，但他们被囚禁在那里，在巴特那、西里古里、金奈。如果你把他们都放了，就会有消息传出。如果你们觉得印度的纳萨尔派运动对你们来说是个问题，我们觉得我们正试图以一种新的方式来处理尼泊尔的问题，所以如果你们释放我们的同志，我们成功地在尼泊尔建立多党民主，这对印度的纳萨尔派运动将是一个非常大的信息。换句话说，这将为他们以新的政治方式进行思考做好准备。光说是不够的；我们需要通过建立民主来验证我们所说的话。”**

**普拉昌达没有要求推进扩张主义的印度统治阶级停止对尼泊尔内政的一切干涉，而只是谈论他们的策略会给印度的毛主义者带来怎样的变化，这实在是一个令人严重关切的问题。更不用说，这些言论不仅会让见识过印度议会民主制度的我国革命群众深恶痛绝，而且会被革命实践证明是完全错误的。**

***提问5：印共马（CPM)及其最高领导人之一西塔拉姆·叶丘里(Sitaram Yechuri)被作为来自印度的救世主，在毛主义者和“最高人民议会”（SPA）之间发挥作用。回到印度后，他和他的政党建议印度毛派遵循尼共（毛）的路线。他们似乎对这里的毛派有敌意，你怎么解释呢？此外，叶丘里告诉记者，印度毛派曾计划杀害他，有关这一秘密决定是尼泊尔毛派告诉他的，请问你对此有何评论？***

**阿扎德：印度共产党（马克思主义）（CPM）是印度统治阶级的政党，代表着印度的帝国主义、封建主义和买办官僚资产阶级的利益。他们的首要任务似乎是将尼泊尔毛派带入议会“主流”，他们也一直在印度向我们宣扬这一点。当我们不同意时，他们就像在西孟加拉邦时一样，用最恶劣的国家恐怖手段来对付我们。他们在这两个国家的目的都是一样的--用子弹“安抚”印度的毛派，用糖衣炮弹“安抚”尼泊尔的毛派。当国大党为卡兰·辛格（Karan Singh）的选举失败而苦恼时，叶丘里和印共马（CPM）实际上为印度统治阶级发挥了更大的作用。但当他的 "外交 "做得太过火而被排挤时，他又炮制了印度毛主义者计划杀死他的阴谋论，以重新获得一些信誉，并试图在两个毛主义政党之间播下不信任的种子。一个真正的Chanakya！！**

注：Chanakya（查纳基亚）：古印度政治家，鼓吹发展深入社会各个阶层的精心设计的间谍系统，并鼓励政治秘密暗杀，多为冷酷无情和诡计多端的形象。

***提问6：您为什么反对尼泊尔共产党(毛主义)提出的多党民主策略？***

**阿扎德：首先，我们对普拉昌达同志在他的各种采访中提出主张深感不安，他说他的党将致力于多党民主，而这种民主不是在无产阶级革命夺取政权后实行，而是在半殖民地半封建社会内实行。2003年尼共（毛）的全体会议文件对多党民主或政治竞争的概念表述得相当模糊，没有说明它是在革命党夺取政权后还是在夺取政权前适用。它只说有可能在反封建、反帝国主义的民主国家宪法范围内组织政治竞争。然而，2005年11月尼泊尔共产党(毛主义)和七党联盟达成12点“德里协议”（Delhi Agreement）后公布的声明、采访和文件都表明，在立宪会议选举后，需要在现有体制内进行竞争。**

**对必须与之进行政治竞争的政党的阶级性质也存在混淆，虽然2003年的文件明确指出这些力量将是反封建和反帝国主义的，但2005年11月以后的文件和尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）的采访为与最高人民议会（SPA）的成员进行这种竞争提供了空间，尽管他们在反对君主制，或者更具体地说，在反对贾南德拉国王的专制统治方面发挥了作用，但他们本质上还是封建-买办资产阶级。**

**事实上，在普拉昌达同志提交并在2003年5月尼共(毛)中央委员会会议上通过的题为《当前形势和我们的任务》的同一份文件中，用以下的话正确描述了尼泊尔议会政党的性质：**

**“在形式上看起来是君主制、议会势力和革命势力的三角斗争，但实质上，从阶级的角度看，只有两种力量(反动势力和民主势力)的斗争。实践证明，君主专制集团和议会集团之间的分歧，无非是在旧国家中的权力分配问题。尼泊尔的情况一再证明，以民族主义为名的君主制和以民主为名的议会势力都想占据权力宝座，在相同的阶级基础上背叛国家和人民。**

**“我们从阶级和理论上讲，在目前的停火和谈判进程中更加暴露出来的是，尼泊尔不同反动集团之间相互指责和矛盾的背后，是不同国际反动中心之间的利益冲突。皇家军队和宫廷成员受到西方帝国主义，特别是美帝国主义的操纵和保护，而议会的主要力量则受到在南亚寻求特殊霸权地位的印度统治者的操纵和保护，他们之间正在进行着拉锯战。因此，全党应该清楚，在政治发展的背景下，特别是在皇宫大屠杀（Nepalese royal massacre）之后，将尼泊尔的君主制或议会力量视为比另一方更民主或更能代表整个民族的想法，将是特别有害和错误的。在今天的尼泊尔，我们更加清楚地认识到，我们永远不可能与君主或议会团体有任何意识形态和政治关系，除非是为了处理特定情况下的矛盾。”**

**虽然上述对议会党派的阶级性、伪民主和对各帝国主义势力的效忠的分析基本上是正确的，但非常不幸的是，尼泊尔共产党(毛主义)没有从战略和阶级的角度坚持这一分析。在结盟条件成熟时，与这些议会势力，甚至与一部分帝国主义者进行必要的调整、理解和战术上的团结，以对抗主要的敌人，这是可以理解的。但是，如果对这些政党的性质产生幻想，或者忽视它们与帝国主义和印度扩张主义的联系，从长远来看，将会对革命造成巨大的损害。**

**此外，我们发现普拉昌达同志和尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）已经将这种斗争方式上升为“21世纪世界革命的战略和道路层面”。因此，普拉昌达同志在接受《印度教徒报》采访时强调，毛派对多党民主制的承诺不是临时性的，而是党内三年来漫长的意识形态斗争的结果。他说。"我们关于多党民主制的决定是一个在战略上、理论上发展起来的立场，我们告诉议会各党派，我们准备与你们所有人进行和平竞争。"**

**尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）领导人直接向买办资产阶级和封建议会政党保证，他的党准备与所有这些政党进行和平竞争。普拉昌达同志把这个关于多党民主的决定说成是一种战略上的、理论上发展起来的立场，提出了一个危险的论点：”同统治阶级政党和平共处，而不是通过革命推翻它们“。在所谓的议会选举中，同所有其他议会政党，包括帝国主义或外国反动统治阶级的政党和平竞争；无限期地放弃建设社会主义的目标；大开封建买办反动派执政的大门，利用人民群众的落后，利用国内外反动派或买办官僚资产阶级、封建小资产阶级势力的大量支持，以民主、民族的名义把社会发展的整个进程从社会主义方向偏离到维持现有制度上（即使是以新形式）。无论我们对建立一个更加民主的制度有什么美好的愿望，管理阶级斗争的法律是不会允许有这样一个制度存在的。历史一次又一次地证明了这一点，从巴黎公社时期一直到亚洲、非洲和拉丁美洲的早期革命。**

***提问7：您是否赞成在夺取政权后实行多党民主？如果不是，你设想的革命后的政府形式是什么？***

**阿扎德：关于最适合无产阶级的政府形式，马列毛主义的理解是公社（Commune）、苏维埃（Soviet）和革命委员会（Revolutionary Council ），它们能最好地服务于无产阶级和绝大多数群众，因为它们不是空谈场所（talking shops）和单纯的立法机构，而是立法和行政机构的结合体。这些机构的代表是选举产生的，在人民认为他们不为自己的利益服务时，可以随时被罢免。如果我们看一下持久人民战争的过程就会发现，它需要在根据地建立由无产阶级领导的所有反帝反封建势力的民主政权，这些政权是在“基层群众会议”（gram sabhas）的民主选举中产生的，同时“基层群众会议”（gram sabha）也有权罢免他们。在这里，权力机构和人民的意愿之间存在着密切的互动，因此是真正的民主。一旦在全印度范围内夺取了政权，直至社会主义阶段，所有真正的反帝反封建的政党都将成为新政权的一部分，而向社会主义的过渡只能通过在无产阶级专政下继续进行阶级斗争来实现（无产阶级专政下继续革命）。这并不是否定广大人民群众的民主，但正如列宁所说：”小生产是经常地,每日每时地,自发地和大批地产生着资本主义和资产阶级的“，这些分子在国家权力的各个领域，包括党，都会有自己的代表。有谁能想到一个更好的政府形式和更好的行使民主的真正意义上的形式？**

**列宁说：“每隔几年决定一次究竟由统治阶级中的什么人在议会里镇压人民、压迫人民——这就是资产阶级议会制的真正本质，不仅在议会制的立宪君主制国家是这样，而且在最民主的共和国也是这样。”**

**这句话是列宁在一个世纪前说的。从那时起，特别是第二次世界大战以来，议会及其相关机构变得更加腐败，腐败到了极点。**

**巴黎公社是一个很好的例子，说明了新政权是如何建立的。在那里实行的概念在苏联“苏维埃”（Soviets USSR）、中国的人民公社和无产阶级文化大革命（GPCR）的实验中得到了进一步的发展，并且正在被毛派在世界各地建立起来的根据地中实行。**

**列宁同志还非常清楚地解释了即使在最民主的共和国中，议会是如何运作的，并将其与公社进行了对比，表明公社(俄国的苏维埃和中国的革命委员会)是最适合无产阶级和劳动群众的政府形式。**

“议会制的资产阶级共和国阻碍和扼杀了群众的独立政治生活，阻碍了他们自下而上地直接参与国家生活的民主组织。而苏维埃的情况则恰恰相反。”

“摆脱议会制的出路，当然不在于取消代表机构和选举制，而在于把代表机构由清谈馆变为“工作”机构。“公社不应当是议会式的，而应当是工作的机构，兼管行政和立法的机构。”

“在公社用来代替资产阶级社会贪汚腐败的议会制的机关中，发表意见和讨论的自由不会流为骗局，因为议员必须亲自工作，亲自执行自己通过的法律，亲自检査在实际生活中执行的结果，亲自对选民负责。....我们不可能想象什么民主，即使是无产阶级民主；而没有议会制，我们却能够想象和应该想象，除非我们对资产阶级社会的批评是空谈，除非推翻资产阶级统治的愿望不是我们真正的和真诚的愿望，而是像孟什维克和社会革命党人，像谢德曼、列金、桑巴、王德威尔得之流的那种骗取工人选票的“竞选”词句。 ......”

-----出处：列宁《国家与革命》第三章 1871年巴黎公社的经验和马克思的分析 （3）取消议会制

***提问8：您如何确保与其他政党的政治竞争？尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）声称，只有组织政治竞争和将群众建立另一个革命党代替执政的权利制度化，才能有效遏制反革命。***

**阿扎德：即使无产阶级在从资本主义向社会主义过渡时期拥有丰富多样的经验，拥有无产阶级文化大革命这种适当的形式、方法和武器，拥有我们的导师--马克思、恩格斯、列宁、斯大林和毛泽东以及一些马克思主义作家关于遏制党、军队和国家资本主义复辟，并建立一个新型的国家和社会的大量著作，尼共（毛）竟然还能得出这样的结论，确实令人震惊。认为通过组织所谓的政治竞争，或者把群众另立革命党代替原先革命党领导国家的权利制度化，就可以确保共产党的不断无产阶级化和革命化，就可以有效地遏制反革命，这意味着落入了资产阶级形式主义的陷阱，破坏了广泛动员群众对旧的反动阶级和在党、军和政府内部发展的新资产阶级进行激烈阶级斗争的真正任务。我们很难理解另立的新革命政党是如何存在的，特别是因为共产党一直认为，不同的政治路线要么代表无产阶级的观点，要么代表资产阶级的观点。**

**关键不在于确保群众通过选举以另一党取代另一党的权利，这是资产阶级共和国或官僚资产阶级-封建共和国的做法，我们要做的是保证群众积极和创造性地监督党和国家，制止新的官僚资产阶级的产生，参与国家和社会的管理以及革命改造的全过程。而党的首要任务是组织和领导人民群众遏制反革命，在无产阶级专政下继续革命，实现所有领域的革命性改造。这是整个世界革命的历史经验，特别是无产阶级文化大革命（GPCR）留给我们的最重要的教训。**

**此外，无产阶级政党能不能提供给战败阶级（被打败的反动阶级）这样一个机会，使他们以“民主”的方式竞争，从而防止其重新掌权，以和平方式或通过政变来遏制反革命？鉴于布尔什维克党在反动思想统治的广大落后农村几乎完全不存在，如果它在革命后组织这样的政治竞争，能不能在俄国赢得选举？布尔什维克党在夺取政权后甚至不得不立即解散立宪会议，尽管它在立宪会议中只占少数，因为立宪会议充当了反动派的工具，成为苏维埃那样进行革命性改革和实行无产阶级专政的障碍。这不仅仅是俄国的情况，在许多国家，特别是在小商品生产和小农经济占主导地位的半殖民地半封建国家，大多数人的封建思想、文化、风俗习惯力量，会使其他披着反封建反帝国主义外衣的非无产阶级派系甚至是反动政党比较容易上台执政。因此，如果我们发现尼共（毛）的理想主义和主观建议虽然是出于好意，但最终成为资产阶级手中夺取政权的便利工具，也就不足为奇了。**

**关于与其他党派的政治竞争，我们有中国的经验，在那里有几个民主党派，如民主同盟、农工党和其他党派与中国共产党竞争，并在各权力机关的选举中竞争。虽然这些政党在革命后存在了近十年，但当他们拒绝支持社会主义建设并试图将中国带入资本主义道路时，人民拒绝了他们。政治竞争在中国得到了鼓励，不是参加西方式的资产阶级议会选举，而是参加各种机构的选举。组成革命力量的四个阶级的民主党派和组织将参加各种机构的选举。**

**中国共产党（CPC）在新民主主义革命期间以及夺取政权、建立人民民主和人民民主专政之后，一直努力团结一切反封建反帝国主义的党派和力量。**

**1957年，毛泽东在《关于正确处理人民内部矛盾》一文中这样阐述了中国共产党在夺取政权后对其他政党的政策：**

“共产党同各民主党派长期共存，这是我们的愿望，也是我们的方针。至于各民主党派是否能够长期存在下去，不是单由共产党一方面的愿望作决定，还要看各民主党派自己的表现，要看它们是否取得人民的信任。各党派互相监督的事实，也早已存在，就是各党派互相提意见，作批评。所谓互相监督，当然不是单方面的，共产党可以监督民主党派，民主党派也可以监督共产党。”

**在中国，为了防止资本主义复辟和新资产阶级在政府和党中的崛起，发展了许多方法。毛泽东的“百花齐放、百家争鸣”；“三三制“（三分法）民主代表制，将共产党员在选举机构中的席位限制在最多三分之一，并将剩余三分之二的席位给予其他政党成员和非党人士；他为政党参选提出了六条政治标准，等等；这只是其中的几个例子。民主不仅仅是一种形式上的表决，而是必须存在于任何组织的活动过程中，领导层要受到群众和干部的密切监督；只有全面提高党和群众的马列毛主义意识，加强阶级斗争，才能做到这一点。在中国，革命后有许多党派分享权力，但这种团结是建立在原则基础上的，是为了深化反封建和反买办官僚资产阶级（CBB）残余势力，是阶级斗争战线的一部分。在尼泊尔，尼共（毛）与封建和买办官僚资产阶级分子组成政府，实际上是淡化了阶级斗争。**

**最重要的是，在无产阶级或人民民主国家里，所有革命机构都是由选举产生的，每一个被选举出来的人都可以被罢免，这在所谓的议会制民主国家中是看不到的。**

***提问9：尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）说它将通过资产阶级民主共和国或多党制进入新的民主阶段时，你觉得有什么不妥吗？***

**阿扎德：没有一个毛主义者会说，为实现民主共和国和推翻君主专制而斗争是错误的。同样，也没有人反对在任何时候建立一个由所有反对主要敌人的人组成的统一战线。不用说，这样一个统一战线在性质上是纯战术性的，这种临时政策在任何情况下都不能也不应该决定革命本身的道路和方向。**

**尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）理论中的问题在于，把反专制斗争变成了新民主主义革命（NDR）的一个次要阶段，更糟糕的是，让这个次要阶段压倒（支配和决定）了革命的方向和道路。党在发动武装斗争之前制定的新民主主义革命的纲领和战略，要推翻的目标，甚至早些时候革命取得进展所依据的具体阶级分析，现在都从属于尼泊尔革命的所谓次要阶段的需要了。这就像尾巴自己摇着狗一样（本末倒置）。资产阶级民主共和国的次要阶段已经成为所有决定性的因素。它将阶级战争并入其中，将持久人民战争战略搁置一边，将多党民主与资产阶级封建政党的政治竞争作为未来尼泊尔革命的重要战略和道路。**

**据我们所知，世界上各种类型的国家制度，可以根据其政权的阶级性，归结为三种基本类型：(一)资产阶级专政的共和国(除此之外，还有落后的半封建半殖民地国家在帝国主义的支持下由买办官僚资产阶级和封建分子联合专政的伪共和国)；(二)无产阶级专政的共和国；(三)几个革命阶级联合专政的共和国。从本质上讲，尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）提出的资产阶级民主共和国的口号，属于第一种类型的共和国，尽管革命党与买办资产阶级-封建政党一起参与组建国家政权。**

**在接受英国广播公司（BBC）记者采访时，普拉昌达同志用以下几句话阐述了他对未来尼泊尔的看法：**

“我们相信，尼泊尔人民将争取建立一个共和国，并以和平的方式推进重建尼泊尔的进程。”

“五年后，尼泊尔将迈向一个美丽、和平和进步的国家。”

“五年后，数百万尼泊尔人将肩负起创造美好未来的使命，尼泊尔将真正开始成为人间天堂。”

**他进一步断言，以这种方式选出的民主共和国将解决尼泊尔人民的问题！！**

“我们相信，随着制宪会议的选举，尼泊尔将形成一个民主共和国。而这将解决尼泊尔人民的问题，将国家引向更进步的道路。”

**任何读过上述文字的人都会认为，这些观点更多地反映了一种民族主义情绪，而不是无产阶级的观念。**

**尼泊尔成为资产阶级共和国后，将如何成为“人间天堂”？民主共和国的成立如何“解决尼泊尔人民的问题”？在现在的帝国主义时代成为共和国后，还能摆脱帝国主义的束缚吗？自称相信马列毛主义的尼泊尔共产党(毛主义)真的认为“重建尼泊尔的进程将以和平方式推进”吗？在世界历史上，有没有发生过这样的和平重建进程的例子？世界革命史不是表明，在无产阶级夺取政权几十年之后，仍然会存在血腥暴力的激烈阶级斗争吗？那么普拉昌达同志怎么会想到这样一个和平的重建尼泊尔的过程呢？**

**最高人民议会（SPA）所属政党真的与尼泊尔的帝国主义、印度扩张主义和封建主义作斗争了吗？尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）能否保证在选举中击败与其进行政治竞争的资产阶级-封建政党，并确保尼泊尔不会落入帝国主义和印度扩张主义的魔爪？人们怎么会天真地相信，一旦制宪会议选举结束，尼泊尔成为共和国，不是在工人阶级政党的领导下，而是在一个杂乱无章的政党联盟领导下（即尼共(毛)领导的统治阶级和工人阶级联盟），这个国家就能摆脱封建主义和帝国主义，成为一个“美丽、和平和进步的国家”？**

**按照普拉昌达同志的意见，**“反动阶级及其政党将试图把这个共和国改造成资产阶级议会制的共和国，我们的无产阶级政党将试图把它改造成新民主主义的共和国。过渡期有多长，目前还不能确定。很明显，这将取决于当时的国内和国际形势以及权力平衡状况。”

**这个所谓的过渡性多党制共和国，要通过与反动阶级及其政党的政治竞争，将其转变为新民主主义共和国，而反动阶级及其政党则试图将其转变为资产阶级议会制共和国！！。**

**无论尼共（毛）采取何种策略，整个事件中最令人反感的部分是它将这些策略作为一种在理论上发展起来的立场，认为它应该成为21世纪革命的典范。在反对教条主义的名义下，我们的尼共（毛）同志正在滑向危险的境地。**

**从普拉昌达同志和尼共(毛)其他领导人的各种采访中，我们可以清楚地看到，尼泊尔毛派的立场已经发生了根本转变，从以争取社会主义和共产主义为直接目标的新民主主义革命，到通过选举建立“多党民主共和国”，以和平方式实现社会变革。这与马列毛主义对国家和革命阶段的理解背道而驰。我们认为，尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）的这一立场以及在民主共和国问题上出现的混乱和偏差，是由于它对尼泊尔现阶段革命的错误结论，正如前面所解释的那样。**

**此外，只要该党与帝国主义和地方反动派进行持续的斗争，奉行重新分配土地和财富、将所有买办、外国工业、银行和外贸国有化的路线，就一定会遭到其他议会党派的反对。如果它想成为议会游戏的一部分，就必须遵守其规则，不能彻底执行其反封建、反帝国主义的政策。即使是司法独立也必须被承认为议会游戏的一部分，并可能对毛主义政党通过选举上台后试图发起的每一项改革造成阻碍。**

**然后会有一些机构，如司法机构、选举委员会、媒体、各种艺术、文化甚至宗教团体、非政府组织，以及一些由统治阶级发起的人权组织等等。如果陷入所谓多党民主共和国的泥潭，他就无法摆脱对这些所谓独立机构的干扰。其中许多机构会成为反动势力的藏身之处，以各种微妙的方式进行反革命活动。我们不能忘记西方机构以微妙的方式渗透和颠覆了东欧国家以及整个苏联社会。**

***提问10：普拉昌达同志说，他的政党所采取的策略，除了借鉴20世纪的革命经验外，还根据世界政治和军事平衡的特殊性，以及尼泊尔特定的阶级、政治和权力平衡的特殊性。贵党对此有何看法？***

**阿扎德：普拉昌达同志在今年二月份接受《印度教徒报》采访时，引用了上述三个因素来说明他的政党作出关于实行多党民主的决定。事实上，早在上述采访之前，这种认知就已经在尼共(毛)身上看到了。例如，在2004年8月的中央委员会会议上，在面对帝国主义以及没有任何强大的革命运动推动，它开始怀疑在尼泊尔这样的小国取得革命胜利的前景。**

“目前的情况下，在中国复辟资本主义的同时，没有其他社会主义国家存在，尽管目前客观条件好转，但在无产阶级领导下的任何强大的革命运动都没有进展，世界帝国主义像一只受伤的老虎一样到处扑向人们，像尼泊尔这种具有特殊地缘政治的小国有可能通过革命获得胜利，达到夺取国家政权的目的吗？这是今天摆在我们党面前的最重要的问题。这个问题的答案只能在马列毛主义中寻找，这取决于尼泊尔革命的未来。”

**这次会议还指出了采取停火、谈判、政治出路等一系列战术措施的原因。**

“毫无疑问，帝国主义势力现在正准备发动更猛烈的进攻，因为尼泊尔人民战争正在准备从目前的战略相持阶段发展到战略进攻阶段。尼泊尔革命的全部复杂性、机遇和挑战都是这一客观条件的表现......，但是，尼泊尔，革命的发展已经到了非常敏感的准备战略进攻的阶段。必须认识到，党采取的停火、谈判、政治出路等一系列战术措施，都是建立在这个战略有利、战术不利的世界形势和国内战略平衡条件下的。”

**诚然，世界各地的革命运动都面临着严峻的形势，尤其是在中国复辟资本主义之后。从战术上讲，在当今世界，敌人的力量相当强大，而我们的主观力量却很薄弱。世界帝国主义向世界各地的革命力量、民族解放运动和人民运动发动了大规模进攻。但这只是问题的一个方面。同时，客观条件是相当有利的；帝国主义，特别是美帝国主义，受到世界各地人民的憎恨，大规模的人民运动正在世界各地爆发，反对帝国主义，特别是美帝国主义。当今世界的任何革命都不可避免地要面对帝国主义的攻击。而我们能够与帝国主义斗争并给其沉重打击的唯一途径就是坚定地、创造性地动员人民发动人民战争。**

**如果尼泊尔共产党(毛主义)对持久人民战争的战略有深刻和透彻的理解，它就能足够清楚地知道如何在外部军事干预的情况下应对局势，将入侵战争转变为全国性的阶级战争，并在战争过程中夺取国家政权。但尼共（毛）对快速胜利的渴望导致它采取了非常危险的捷径方法，即通过临时政府上台，并在制宪会议选举后参加所谓的多党民主共和国选举。虽然它所取得的连续成功是创造性地应用持久人民战争战略的结果，但它错误地将其综合为持久人民战争与武装起义的融合战略。它期望在短时间内取得最后的胜利，并在2004年8月宣布进入战略反攻阶段。但在意识到占领城镇，特别是首都加德满都的困难，以及印度武装部队和美帝国主义势力可能的干涉之后，由于对持久人民战争的战略缺乏正确的认识，它选择了一条资产阶级民主共和国的坦途，尽管尼共（毛）肯定地表示，这永远不会使国家走向新民主主义和社会主义。**

**因此，尼共（毛）没有坚持马列毛主义关于必须粉碎旧国家，建立无产阶级国家(在尼泊尔半封建半殖民地的具体条件下的人民民主国家)，通过彻底改造社会和一切压迫的阶级关系向社会主义目标前进的认识，而是选择通过选举产生的制宪会议和资产阶级民主共和国来改革现有的国家。它甚至说：“如果人民选择君主立宪制和多党民主，我们愿意接受人民的决定。”尽管毛主义政党在农村大部分地区拥有事实上的权力，但最终还是落到了这样的政治地位，这确实是一场巨大的悲剧。**

***提问11：普拉昌达同志说，多党民主的路线也适用于印度的毛主义运动。贵党是如何看待这个问题的？***

**阿扎德：我们在他接受《印度教徒报》采访时看到了他对这一点的评价。上面写着：**

“我们认为这也适用于他们。我们想就此展开辩论。他们必须明白这一点，并沿着这条路线走下去。无论是在领导问题上，还是在多党民主问题上，或者更确切地说，在多党竞争问题上，我认为那些自称印度革命者的人都需要考虑这些问题。而且有必要朝着这个方向去实践。我们希望与他们就此进行辩论。如果革命者不去关注意识形态（思想）的建设，他们就不会有任何进展。”

**长期以来，印度各统治阶级议会政党一直在提出这样的建议。宣称“信奉马列主义”的修正主义印度共产党（CPI）和印度共产党（马克思主义）【CPI(M)】经常通过他们的杂志、文件和声明进行说教，认为武装斗争对于夺取国家政权和实现革命的社会变革是徒劳的。他们不顾一切地试图表明，议会多党民主是实现这一社会变革的最佳工具，就像西孟加拉邦和喀拉拉邦所见证的那样。印度共产党（马列）解放派【CPI（ML）-Liberation】以马列毛主义的名号宣扬多党民主的优点，把所有不愿意被束缚在议会猪圈里的人称为无政府主义者和冒进者。**

**尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）希望与印度的毛派就领导权和多党民主制问题进行辩论，这是一件好事。我们两党的领导层之间就领导权的概念，就个人崇拜和个人权力过度集中的问题等进行了有趣的讨论，交换了意见和经验。我们的意见是，党的领导层中有相当一部分人有必要在群众中工作，即使在夺取政权后也要集中精力进行阶级斗争建设，以防止党的工作人员、国家各部门官员，特别是军队、生产领域的各个单位的官员的腐化堕落。要鼓励群众批评党和党的领导人在夺取政权之前的革命运动中所犯的错误，要发展集体领导，而不是把注意力放在任何一个人身上或下放革命的权力。依赖于一个或几个人，而不是发展集体领导，让全体党员和群众参与决策，是导致俄国和中国政治局势出现重大逆转的原因之一，在斯大林和毛泽东等杰出的无产阶级领导人去世后，苏联共产党（CPSU）和中国共产党(CPC)很容易就堕落成了修正主义政党。**

**我们同意普拉昌达同志所说的，"从20世纪社会主义国家的经验教训来看，我们希望在领导权方面进入一个新的层面--在这个层面上，一个人不会一直是党的领袖或国家元首。”**

**事实上，这也是2004-05年尼泊尔共产党(毛主义)党内斗争的主要争论点之一， 当时巴特拉伊（Laldhoj，拉尔德霍伊）同志在《党内讨论的基本问题》中提出了诸如以下问题。无产阶级领导是集体的集中体现，还是以个人为中心？辩证法的基本规律，即一分为二，是否适用于主要领导？一个人占据党、军队和国家的最高职位，而且是终身的，这种制度是如何解决产生革命接班人和持续革命的问题的？我们党，印度共产党（毛主义）希望就这些问题以及普拉昌达道路问题和路线、思想和主义的概念进行认真的辩论。**

***提问12：最后，您对普拉昌达同志领导的尼泊尔共产党(毛主义)提出的“21世纪民主概念”有何看法？***

**阿扎德：尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）提出的“21世纪民主概念”有什么新东西？它与20世纪的民主有什么质的区别？尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）还声称，其“关于多党民主的决定在战略上和理论上都是成熟的”，这甚至适用于印度的情况。我们知道资产阶级民主和无产阶级民主，民主也是有阶级性的，在阶级分化的社会里，民主是为统治阶级服务的，是对人民实行专政的。在资产阶级共和国里，民主的本质是资产阶级的。它的目的是为资产阶级服务，同时压迫绝大多数的人民，本质上是资产阶级专政。同样，在人民民主共和国，民主是为所有反封建、反帝国主义的阶级服务的，而专政则是对人民的敌人及其代理人实行的。不同类型的民主制度之间的本质上区别在于其阶级性。但是，当尼共（毛）说20世纪和21世纪的民主有质的区别，而没有提到阶级性时，这不仅没有说服力，而且似乎是非常主观的看法。**

**尼共（毛）给出的一个理由是，在21世纪，“世界科学技术，特别是电子通信技术取得了前所未有的发展”。这一史无前例的发展对21世纪的革命战略或21世纪的民主性质有何影响尚不清楚。**

**它说，"在意识形态领域，中央委员会根据对当今世界形势的分析，主要是对帝国主义全球化和无产阶级运动的新分析，试图绘制世界革命的战略纲要，并成功地提出了关于领导和完成革命以及遏制反革命的全新概念"，"在政治领域 "它说， "在20世纪确立的政治军事战略战术观念上有了质的飞跃"。**

**我们仍然不清楚尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）声称的新概念和质的飞跃是什么，除了他们的多党民主和政治竞争路线。归根结底是在一个所谓的过渡性多党民主共和国中与各种反动和修正主义政党进行和平竞争。**

***提问13：最后一个问题。你想向尼泊尔、印度和世界其他国家的革命队伍传达什么信息？***

**阿扎德：首先，我们严肃要求尼泊尔共产党（毛主义）及其领导层重新考虑其最近的一些立场，并从过去的错误经历中吸取教训。尼泊尔党和人民有着伟大的斗争和牺牲的历史。在这场人民战争中，有一万多人失去了生命。我们向尼泊尔和世界革命的这些英雄烈士致敬。我们相信，伟大的尼泊尔人民一定会在曲折的运动中把革命向前推进。毫无疑问，今天的革命不是一件简单的事情，道路将是曲折的。**

**我们也呼吁印度人民全力支持尼泊尔革命。但是，在这样做的同时，印度和世界无产阶级也有责任向他们在尼泊尔的同志们提出友好的建议。毕竟，尼泊尔革命的利益非常符合世界革命的利益，尤其是它的邻国印度的革命利益。印度的革命人民已经准备好为支持尼泊尔革命而作出任何牺牲。我们有信心共同前进，反对可憎的世界帝国主义体系及其地方半封建基础。**

***《人民进行曲》：我们代表《人民进行曲》杂志感谢您对邻国这一重大事件的采访。***

***阿扎德：谢谢***

**“We have Experiences of Several Countries where**

**the Toiling Masses Suffered Heavily Due to the**

**Wrong Line of the Communist Party”**

**Com. Azad, Spokesperson,**

**CPI(Maoist), on Nepal Developments**

***People’s March, Volume 7, No.6 & 7, June-July 2006***

*(With the latest developments in Nepal and the tactics and Strategy now*

*being put forward by the CPN(Maoist) and the continuous appeals by*

*Indian Marxist and revisionists to the India Maoists to learn from the*

*Nepalese Maoists, People’s March has been trying to get the response of*

*the Indian Maoists. At last we have received by e-mail a response from the*

*spokesperson of the CPI(Maoists) which, to a large extent, gives their*

*response. We are giving below an interview taken by our correspondent*

*with comrade Azad, the spokesperson of the CC, CPI(Maoist) in end June*

*2006)*

***PM: How do you look at the current developments in Nepal?***

**Azad:** We, in India, have been watching the ongoing developments in Nepal

with great interest. The militant mass agitation by the people of Nepal

against the reactionary, autocratic regime of King Gyanendra in April, in the

backdrop of the powerful armed struggle, was indeed historic. The peopleof Nepal had inscribed a glorious chapter in the annals of Nepal by forcing

the fascist King to relinquish his adamant stand and to concede power to

the parliament. Our Party hails the historic struggle of the people of Nepal

for democracy and a better society. However, it had been the expectation

of the revolutionaries in India that the struggle in Nepal would go on until

the overthrow of the King and capture of power by the revolutionary and

democratic forces. We would have preferred to see a siege of the Narayanhitti

palace and its overrun by the people. We hoped that the Maoists would

wrest the initiative from the hands of the seven party alliance which wants

to strike a compromise with the King and betray the aspirations of the

people. This appeared possible. But events have not turned out that way.

We can say that the people’s aspirations have been fulfilled partially.

***PM: How do you view the tactics of the CPN(Maoist) in joining the***

***interim government and promising to abide by the verdict of the***

***constituent assembly?***

**Azad:** The situation in Nepal and the World is complex. Due to the weakness

in the international communist movement we see many a people’s war

bogged down in a struggle for survival for decades. In this situation it is no

doubt that the Nepalese party and people have made historic advances. But

we feel there is need for caution with the present tactics. We think that

Maoists forming a government jointly with the comprador bourgeois-feudal

parties such as the reactionary Nepali Congress, revisionist CPN-UML and

the other parties of the ruling classes will not aid, but actually harm, the

cause of revolution. The very thinking that one can reform the state peacefully

from within without smashing it is against the fundamental teachings of our

Marxist teachers regarding state and revolution. One may bring some reforms

from above and satisfy certain deprived sections of the people but it will

never solve the basic problems of the people as you cannot smash feudalism

and throw out imperialism from the soil of Nepal by utilizing the old state

whatever embellishments one might do to give it a refurbished image.

Nothing short of a revolutionary upheaval of the masses can achieve the

above objective.

The present stand of the CPN(Maoist) is no doubt surprising after they

had brilliantly built up their people’s army of about 25,000, their BaseAreas, the UF and their new Organs of Power, and had stated that they

were in the phase of the strategic offensive to seize power. In the process

they effectively defeated all efforts of the police and RNA to crush them,

maintaining the military and political initiative. But now there is no reference

even to the strategic offensive and how it is to advance.

As regards the stand of the CPN(Maoist) that it will go by the verdict of

the constituent assembly even if the latter favours a constitutional monarchy,

we think it only means tailing behind the masses and abdicating the

revolutionary responsibility of enhancing the consciousness of the masses

and leading them.

***PM: And what about the dissolution of the revolutionary organs of power***

***and merging of the two armies?***

**Azad:** These organs are the product of protracted people’s war against the

old state and they stand out as shining examples of people’s democratic

dictatorship at the local level brilliantly built by the CPN(Maoist) party. The

immediate task and the tactics should serve to strengthen these organs and

mould them into organs of uprising like the Soviets in revolutionary Russia

and China. While consolidating these organs of power we must strive to

mobilize the masses in a big way into uprisings and strive to capture the

cities leading to the final seizure of power at the opportune moment. In fact

in the concrete situation in Nepal today the Maoists have really only two

revolutionary options. Either they must intensify the mass upsurge, evolve

the organizational forms of political power suitable for seizing political power

at the national/all Nepal level or if that is not possible owing to an unfavourable

balance of class forces the existing base areas should be consolidated and

strengthened and steps taken to complete the democratic tasks and advance

towards in the direction of the socialist tasks. It is possible that in this

process two Nepals will emerge – a reactionary one based in Kathmandu

and few cities and a revolutionary Nepal based in the countryside. Instead

of taking recourse to one of the two options, dismantling these organs

means sacrificing the basic class interests of the working class and the

toiling masses.

As regards merging the army within a reconstituted state army, it is
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have nothing. The army is one of the main instruments of class rule. How

can two diametrically opposed classes have a single army? By merging the

people’s army with the reactionary army of the ruling classes (until now the

faithful servant of the King) the Maoists have further endangered the interests

of the people. The people will become defenceless in case of a reactionary

armed offensive by the enemy. We have experiences of several countries

where the toiling masses suffered heavily due to the wrong line of the

Communist party. In Indonesia we know of the cruel massacres of

communists and their sympathizers carried out by the ruling classes due to

the line of hobnobbing with the reactionary ruling classes whom they

considered as nationalist and democratic forces. We also have before us the

examples of Chile, Nicaragua and several other countries. One cannot rule

out the possibility of the reactionary ruling classes carrying out a coup and

reestablishing their monopoly over political power at an opportune moment

when the revolutionary forces have been effectively disarmed or weakened.

This has been the experience in several countries following the 2nd World

War i.e France, Greece etc. But, of course, if the Maoists do not pose a

threat to the interests of imperialism and the comprador bureaucratic

bourgeois (CBB) and they get accommodated and incorporated into the

system then they too would be received with warmth by the ruling classes.

The invitation to the UN to supervise the cease fire and monitor the

demobilization of the people’s armed forces is extremely dangerous. The

UN is essentially an instrument of imperialism and particularly American

imperialism. It is bound to work in the interests of the reactionary ruling

classes of Nepal and imperialism. Overall, the decision of the CPN(Maoist)

to dissolve the revolutionary people’s governments in the countryside and

to merge the PLA with the reactionary army will unfold an irreversible

process of losing all the revolutionary gains achieved till now.

***PM: The various parliamentary parties in India, not to speak of the Left***

***parties like the CPI and CPI(M), have been hailing the line of participation***

***in the interim government and parliamentary democracy taken by the***

***Nepali Maoists and say that it will have a positive impact on the Maoist***

***movement in India. How does your Party assess its impact?***
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developments in Nepal will have a “positive” (what they mean by positive

is the Maoists shunning armed struggle and joining the so-called mainstream

of parliamentary politics) impact on the Maoist movement in our country.

Anyone who is familiar with the history of the Maoist movement in India,

with the numerous ups and downs it had gone through in the past four

decades after Naxalbari, knows how resilient our movement is. Even when

confronted with great difficulties and odds against the revolutionaries, the

genuine Maoists in India never vacillated or drifted from their line of new

democratic revolution and achieving it through the line of protracted people’s

war. They had not only rejected the parliamentary path but also fought

against the parties who wanted to participate in elections in the name of

utilizing it as a tactic. Of course, there are some pseudo revolutionary parties,

like the CPI(ML)-Liberation which had degenerated into parliamentary

parties but these stand exposed before the people as revisionist parties in

the guise of MLM.

No wonder, the various ruling class parties and the so-called left parties

in India are elated at the change of stance by the CPN(Maoist) led by

comrade Prachanda. They are naturally hailing the line taken by the

CPN(Maoist) and are calling upon the Maoists in India to realize the futility

of armed struggle and to follow the Maoists of Nepal by participating in the

parliamentary pig-sty in India. As bitter enemies and opponents of revolution

all these parties have been in the forefront in suppressing the ongoing people’s

war in India. The decision of the CPN(Maoist) to participate in the

government along with the reactionary parties, declaring their commitment

to the so-called rule of law and the future constitution, and to become

actors in the ensuing game of parliamentary elections following the elections

to the constituent assembly has come as a breather for the ruling class

parties in Nepal and the parliamentary system of India.

In fact, in his interview with The Hindu last February, comrade

Prachanda himself hinted at the “positive” impact that his line of multiparty

democracy will have on the Maoist movement in India. It must have come

as a great relief for the Indian ruling classes to hear comrade Prachanda

speak of his Party’s commitment to multiparty democracy and the message

he wants to give to the Naxalite movement in India by successfully
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When asked what he would say if he were to meet the Indian Prime

Minister Manmohan Singh, comrade Prachanda said:

“We are fighting for genuine multiparty democracy but they are

imprisoned there, in Patna, Siliguri, Chennai. If you release them all, a

message will go out. And if you feel the Naxalite movement in India is a

problem for you, we feel we are trying to deal with the problems in Nepal

in a new way, so if you release our comrades and we are successful in

establishing multiparty democracy in Nepal, this will be a very big message

for the Naxalite movement in India. In other words, the ground will be

readied for them to think in a new political way. Words are not enough; we

need to validate what we are saying by establishing that democracy.”

It is really a matter of grave concern that comrade Prachanda, instead

of demanding the expansionist Indian ruling classes to stop all interference

and meddling in Nepal’s internal affairs, only talked of how their tactics

would bring about a change in the outlook of the Maoists in India. Needless

to say, these remarks will not only be deeply resented by the revolutionary

masses of our country who have seen the wretched system of parliamentary

democracy in India but will also be proved totally wrong through their

revolutionary practice.

***PM: The CPM and one of its top leaders, Sitaram Yechuri, was focused***

***as a messiah from India to play a role between the Maoists and SPA.***

***After returning back to India he and his party advised the Indian Maoists***

***to follow the line of the CPN(Maoist). How do you explain this when***

***they seem hostile to the Maoists here? Apart from this Yechury told the***

***press that the Indian Maoists have planned to kill him and the secret***

***regarding this decision was informed to him by the Nepali Maoists.***

***What is your comment please?***

**Azad:** The CPM is a party of the Indian ruling classes, representing the

interests of imperialism, feudalism and the CBB in India. Their primary

task seemed to be to bring the Nepalese Maoists into the parliamentary

‘mainstream’ which they also keep preaching to us in India. When we do

not accede they have used the worst forms of state terror against us as in
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Maoists in India with bullets and do the same with the Nepalese Maoists

with sugar-coated bullets. Yechuri and the CPM in effect played a more

affective role for the Indian ruling classes when the Congress was fumbling

with the Karan Singh fiasco. But when he overdid his ‘diplomacy’ and was

sidelined, he cooked up the conspiracy theory of the Maoists in India planning

to kill him to regain some credibility and try and sow seeds of mistrust

between the two Maoist parties. A true Chanakya!!

***PM: Why are you opposed to the tactic of multiparty democracy as***

***proposed by the CPN(Maoist)?***

**Azad:** Firstly, we are greatly perturbed by the proposal put forth by comrade

Prachanda in his various interviews that his party was committed to multiparty

democracy which will be practiced not after the revolutionary seizure of

power by the proletariat but within the semi-colonial semi-feudal society.

The 2003 Plenum document was quite vague regarding CPN(Maoist)’s

concept of multiparty democracy or political competition, i.e., whether it is

applicable after the seizure of power by the revolutionary party or prior to

seizure itself. It only says it is possible to organize political competition

within the constitutional limits of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist

democratic state. However, the statements, interviews and documents

released after the 12-point Delhi Agreement between the CPN(Maoist) and

the Seven Party Alliance in November 2005 all point to the need for

competition within the existing system after the Constituent Assembly is

elected.

There is also confusion regarding the class character of the Parties with

whom such political competition has to be conducted. While the 2003

document clearly stated that these forces will be anti-feudal and anti

imperialist in character, the post November 2005 documents and interviews

of CPN(MAOIST) provide scope for such competition with the constituents

of SPA who are basically comprador bourgeois-feudal in their character in

spite of their role against monarchy, or, more specifically, against King

Gyanendra’s autocratic rule.

In fact, in the same document entitled “Present situation and our tasks”,
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Meeting of the CPN (Maoist) in May 2003, it correctly described the nature

of the parliamentary parties in Nepal in the following words—

“In form it may appear as a triangular struggle involving monarchy,

parliamentary forces and revolutionary forces, but in essence and if one

looks from a class point of view, the struggle involving only two forces

(reactionary and democratic forces) are seen. It has been practically proved

that the differences between the autocratic monarchical and parliamentary

groups are nothing other than that of share of power within the old state. It

has been time and again proved in Nepal that monarchy in the name of

nationalism (fake) and parliamentary forces in the name of democracy (fake)

want to occupy the seat of power and betray the nation and the people on

identical class basis.

“What we have been saying from a class and theoretical point of view

and what has become all the more exposed in the present cease-fire and

negotiation process is that it is the clash of interests between different

international reactionary centers which is behind the mutual recriminations

and contradictions between different reactionary groups in Nepal. As the

royal army and the palace elements are being manipulated and protected by

western imperialism, particularly American imperialism, and the main

parliamentary forces by the Indian rulers who seek special hegemony in

South Asia, they are having a continuous tug of war between them. Hence

the whole Party should be clear that, in the background of political

development particularly after the palace massacre, the idea of seeing either

the monarchical or the parliamentary forces of Nepal as more democratic

or more nationalistic than the other, will be specially harmful and wrong. It

has become all the more clear in the present day Nepal that we can never

have any ideological and political relationship with either monarchical or

parliamentary groups except to manage contradictions in a particular

situation.”

While the above analysis of the class character of the parliamentary

parties, their fake democracy and loyalty to various imperialist powers, is

basically correct, it is indeed very unfortunate that the CPN(MAOIST) has

not adhered firmly to that analysis from a strategic and class perspective. It
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unity with these parliamentary forces and even with a section of the

imperialists against the main enemy when conditions for such alliances

become ripe. But to create illusions on the character of these parties or

overlook their links with imperialists and Indian expansionists will do great

harm to the revolution in the long run.

Moreover, we find that comrade Prachanda and the CPN(Maoist) had

turned the tactics to the level of strategy and path of the world revolution in

the 21st century. Thus, in his interview to The Hindu comrade Prachanda

stressed that the Maoists' commitment to multi-party democracy is not

tactical but the result of a lengthy ideological debate within the party over

three years. He said: "our decision on multi-party democracy is a strategically,

theoretically developed position and we are telling the parliamentary parties

that we are ready to have peaceful competition with you all."

The CPN(Maoist) leader directly assured the comprador bourgeois

feudal parliamentary parties that his Party is ready to have peaceful

competition with all of them. And by describing this decision on multiparty

democracy as a strategically, theoretically developed position comrade

Prachanda has brought a dangerous thesis to the fore—the thesis of peaceful

coexistence with the ruling class parties instead of overthrowing them through

revolution; peaceful competition with all other parliamentary parties,

including the ruling class parties that are stooges of imperialism or foreign

reaction, in a so-called parliamentary elections; abandoning the objective

of building socialism for an indefinite period; and opening the doors wide

for the feudal-comprador reactionaries to come to power by utilizing the

backwardness of the masses and the massive backing from domestic and

foreign reactionaries or the comprador bureaucratic bourgeois and feudal

and petty bourgeois forces to hijack the entire course of development of

the society from the socialist direction to maintaining the existing system

(even if in a new form) in the name of democracy and nationalism. Whatever

may be our good intentions for building a more democratic system, the

laws governing class struggle will not permit of such a system. History has

proved this time and again from the days of the Paris Commune right up till

the earlier revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America.
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***seizure of power? If not what is the form of government you envisage***

***after the revolution?***

**Azad:** The Marxist-Leninist-Maoist understanding regarding the form of

government that will be best suited for the proletariat is the Commune or

the Soviet or the Revolutionary Council that can best serve the proletariat

and the vast majority of the masses as they act not as talking shops and

mere legislative bodies but as both legislative and executive bodies. The

representatives to these bodies are elected and are subject to recall any time

the people feel they do not serve their interests. If we look at the very

process of the protracted people’s war it entails the setting up democratic

power in the Base Areas of all anti-imperialist and anti-feudal forces UNDER

THE LEADERSHIP OF PROLETARIAT elected democratically at gram

sabhas with the right to remove them also by the gram sabha. Here there is

a close interaction between the power structures and the will of the people

and therefore truly democratic. Once power is seized at the all-India level,

till the transformation to the socialist stage all genuinely anti-imperialist and

anti-feudal parties will be part of the new power, and the transition to

socialism can only take place through continuing the class struggle under

the dictatorship of the proletariat. This does not deny democracy for the

masses at large but, as Lenin said, petty production generates a bourgeoisie

daily, hourly and these elements will find their representative at all realms

of state power, including the Party. Can anyone think of a better form of

government and better form of exercising democracy in the real sense of

the term?

“To decide once every few years which members of the ruling class is

to repress and crush the people through parliament--this is the real essence

of bourgeois parliamentarism, not only in parliamentary- constitutional

monarchies, but also in the most democratic republics”, said Lenin.

This was said by Lenin over a century back. Since then, particularly

since World War II, the parliament and its related institutions have become

even more corrupt and rotten to the core.

A good example of how the new power was built was the Paris

Commune. The concepts practiced there were further worked out in the
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GPCR and is being sought to be practiced in the Base Areas being set up by

the Maoists in different parts of the world.

Comrade Lenin also explained very lucidly how the Parliament functions

even in the most democratic of the republics and, contrasting it to the

Commune, showed how the Communes (or the Soviets in Russia and

Revolutionary Councils in China) are the most suitable forms of government

for the proletariat and the toiling masses.

“The parliamentary bourgeois republic hampers and stifles the

independent political life of the masses, their direct participation in the

democratic organisation of the life of the state from the bottom up. The

opposite is the case with the Soviets.

"The way out of parliamentarism is not, of course, the abolition of

representative institutions and the elective principle, but the conversion of

the representative institutions from talking shops into "working" bodies.

"The Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary body, executive

and legislative at the same time."

"The Commune substitutes for the venal and rotten parliamentarism of

bourgeois society institutions in which freedom of opinion and discussion

does not degenerate into deception, for the parliamentarians themselves

have to work, have to execute their own laws, have themselves to test the

results achieved in reality, and to account directly to their constituents. ….

We cannot imagine democracy, even proletarian democracy, without

representative institutions, but we can and must imagine democracy without

parliamentarism, if criticism of bourgeois society is not mere words for us,

if the desire to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie is our earnest and

sincere desire, and not a mere "election" cry for catching workers' votes, as

it is with the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries…”

***PM: And how do you ensure political competition with other parties?***

***The CPN(Maoist) claims that it is only by organizing political competition***

***and institutionalizing the right of the masses to install an alternative***

***revolutionary party in power that counter-revolution can be effectively***

***checked.***
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conclusion even after the proletariat is equipped with rich and varied

experiences on the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, after it

is armed with such an appropriate form, method and weapon as the cultural

revolution and is in possession of a wealth of writings by our teachers--

Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao—and by several Marxist writers on

the subject of checking the degeneration of the Party, Army and the State;

preventing the restoration of capitalism; and building a new type of state

and society. To think that continuous proletarianization and revolutionization

of the Communist Party can be ensured and that counter-revolution can be

effectively checked by organizing so-called political competition or by

institutionalizing the right of the masses to install an alternative revolutionary

party or leadership on the state means falling into the trap of bourgeois

formalism and undermining the real task of mobilizing the masses extensively

to wage bitter class struggle against the old reactionary defeated classes and

the new bourgeois class developing within the Party, Army and the

Administration. It is difficult to grasp how alternative revolutionary parties

can exist- especially since the communist parties have always understood

that different political lines represented either a proletarian outlook or a

bourgeois outlook.

The crucial point lies not in ensuring the right of the masses to replace

one Party by another through elections, which is anyway the norm in any

bourgeois republic or bureaucrat bourgeois-feudal republic, but ensuring

their active and creative involvement in supervising the Party and the state,

in checking the emergence of a new bureaucratic class, and themselves

taking part in the administration of the state and society and in the entire

process of revolutionary transformation. And it will be the foremost task of

the Party to organize and lead the masses in checking counter-revolution

and bringing about the revolutionary transformation in all spheres through

continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. And this is

the most important lesson handed down to us by the entire historical

experience of the world revolution, particularly by the GPCR.

Moreover, is it possible for the Party of the proletariat to prevent the

comeback of the defeated classes to power and check counter-revolution

peacefully or by a coup by providing such an opportunity to them to compete
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elections in Russia after the revolution had it organized such political

competition given its near-total absence in the vast backward countryside

where the most reactionary ideas ruled the roost? In fact, the Bolshevik

Party had to even dissolve the constituent assembly immediately after it

captured power despite the fact that it was only a minority in it as the

constituent assembly acted as an instrument of the reactionaries and became

an obstacle for carrying out revolutionary reforms and for exercising

proletarian dictatorship as in the Soviets. It is not just the case of Russia, in

many countries, particularly in semi-colonial semi-feudal countries, where

petty commodity production and peasant economy predominate, the feudal

ideology, culture, customs and the force of habit among the majority of the

population will make it possible for other non-proletarian and even reactionary

parties under the anti-feudal anti-imperialist cloak to come to power relatively

easily. Hence it will not be surprising if we find that the idealist and subjective

proposal of the CPN(Maoist), though made with good intentions, ultimately

becomes a convenient tool in the hands of the capitalist-roaders to seize

power.

As regards political competition with other parties, we have the experience

of China where several democratic parties such as the Democratic League,

Peasants and Workers’ Party and others competed with the CPC and

contested in elections to the various organs of power. Although these existed

for almost a decade after the revolution the people rejected them when

they refused to support socialism and tried to take China along the capitalist

road. Political competition was encouraged in China, not in the form of

participation in Western-type bourgeois parliamentary elections but in the

elections to various bodies. Democratic parties and organizations belonging

to the four classes that comprised the motive forces of revolution were to

take part in the elections to the various bodies.

The CPC had strived to unite all the anti-feudal anti-imperialist parties

and forces during the new democratic revolution and also after the seizure

of power and establishment of people's democracy or the people’s democratic

dictatorship.

In his article On the correct handling of contradictions among the people,

in 1957, Mao explained the policy of the CPC towards other political parties
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“It is the desire as well as the policy of the Communist Party to exist

side by side with the democratic parties for a long time to come. But whether

the democratic parties can long remain in existence depends not merely on

the desire of the Communist Party but on how well they acquit themselves

and on whether they enjoy the trust of the people. Mutual supervision

among the various parties is also a long-established fact, in the sense that

they have long been advising and criticizing each other. Mutual supervision

is obviously not a one-sided matter; it means that the Communist Party can

exercise supervision over the democratic parties, and vice versa.”

In China many methods were evolved to prevent capitalist restoration

and the rise of a new bourgeoisie in the Government and Party. Mao’s let a

hundred flowers blossom and let a hundred schools of thought contend; his

'Three-thirds' system of democratic representation which restricts the seats

of Communist party members in all elected bodies to a maximum of one

third of the whole and gives two-thirds of the seats to members of other

parties and non-party elements; his putting six political criteria for political

parties to stand for elections; etc; are only a few of the examples adopted.

Democracy is not merely a formal putting a vote but must exist in the very

living process of any organisation, with the leadership under the close

supervision of the masses and cadre; this too is possible with only a general

raising of MLM consciousness of the Party and the masses and intensifying

the class struggle. In China there were many parties after the revolution

sharing power, but the unity was on a principled basis, and was part of the

front to deepen the class struggle against the remnants of the feudal and

CBB forces. In Nepal they in effect dilute the class struggle by forming a

government with feudal and CBB elements.

The most important thing is that all the revolutionary bodies in the

proletarian or people’s democratic state are elected and every person so

elected is subject to recall which is not seen in the so-called parliamentary

democracies.

***PM: Do you find anything wrong when the CPN(Maoist) says it will go***

***to the new democratic stage via the bourgeois democratic or multiparty***

***republic?***
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and for the overthrow of the autocratic monarchy. And likewise, none would

oppose the forging of a united front of all those who are opposed to the

main enemy at any given moment. Needless to say, such a united front

would be purely tactical in nature and cannot, and should not, under any

circumstances, determine the path and direction of the revolution itself.

The problem with the theorization by the CPN(Maoist) lies in making

the fight against autocracy into a sub-stage of NDR and, what is even

worse, making the sub-stage overwhelm (dominate and determine) the very

direction and path of the revolution. The programme and strategy of NDR

drawn up by the Party prior to its launching of the armed struggle, its

targets to be overthrown, and even the concrete class analysis made earlier

based on which the revolution had advanced so far, are now made subordinate

to the needs of the so-called sub-stage of Nepalese revolution. It is like the

case of the tail itself wagging the dog. The sub-stage of a bourgeois

democratic republic has become the all-determining factor. It has subsumed

the class war, set aside the strategy of protracted people’s war, brought

multiparty democracy or political competition with the bourgeois-feudal

parties as the most important strategy, nay, path, of the future Nepalese

revolution.

As far as we know, , we can say that the numerous types of state

system in the world can be reduced to three basic kinds according to the

class character of their political power: (1) republics under bourgeois

dictatorship {in addition to these there are the fake republics in the backward

semi-feudal, semi-colonial countries under the joint dictatorship of the CBB

and feudal elements, backed by imperialism ); (2) republics under the

dictatorship of the proletariat; and (3) republics under the joint dictatorship

of several revolutionary classes. In essence, the slogan of a bourgeois

democratic republic given by the CPN(Maoist) cannot but come under the

first type of republic in spite of the participation of the revolutionary party

in the state power along with the comprador bourgeois-feudal parties.

In his interview with BBC correspondent, comrade Prachanda gave

his vision of future Nepal in the following words:

"We believe that the Nepali people will go for a republic and in a peaceful
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"In five years' time Nepal will move towards being a beautiful, peaceful

and progressive nation.

"In five years' time the millions of Nepalis will already be moving ahead

with a mission to make a beautiful future, and Nepal will truly start becoming

a heaven on earth.”

He further asserted that a democratic republic elected in such a way

will solve the problems of Nepalis!!

“We believe that with the election of a constituent assembly, a democratic

republic will be formed in Nepal. And this will solve the problems of Nepalis

and lead the country into a more progressive path.”

Anyone reading the above lines would think that these views reflect

more a nationalist sentiment than a proletarian class outlook.

How will Nepal start becoming a "heaven on earth" after becoming a

bourgeois republic? How can the formation of a democratic republic "solve

the problems of Nepalis"? Can it free itself from the clutches of imperialism

after becoming a republic in the present imperialist era? Does the

CPN(MAOIST), which claims to believe in MLM, really think that the

“process of rebuilding Nepal will go forward in a peaceful way”? And is

there a single instance in world history where such peaceful process of

rebuilding has taken place? Does not the history of world revolution show

that bitter class struggle, bloody and violent at times, continues even after

decades following the capture of power by the proletariat? Then how could

comrade Prachanda think of such a peaceful process of rebuilding Nepal

even at this sub-stage?

Do the parties belonging to the SPA really fight imperialism, Indian

expansionism and feudalism in Nepal? Is there a guarantee that the

CPN(MAOIST) will defeat the bourgeois-feudal parties, with which it wants

to go for political competition, in the elections and ensure that Nepal does

not drift into the clutches of imperialism and Indian expansionism? How

could one be so naive as to believe that once the elections to the Constituent

Assembly are over and Nepal becomes a Republic, not under the leadership

of the working class party but may be under an alliance of a hotch-potch

***September 2004 - August 2014***  **109**combination of Parties i.e., an alliance of ruling class and working class

under CPN(MAOIST), the country would free itself from feudalism and

imperialism and become a "beautiful, peaceful and progressive nation" ?

According to comrade Prachanda’s opinion, “the reactionary class and

their parties will try to transform this republic into bourgeois parliamentarian

one, where as our party of the proletariat class will try to transform it into

new democratic republic. How long will be the period of transition, is not a

thing that can right now be ascertained. It is clear that it will depend upon

the then national and international situation and state of power balance.”

This so-called transitional multiparty republic is sought to be transformed

into a new democratic republic through peaceful struggle by means of political

competition with reactionary class and their parties which try to transform

it into a bourgeois parliamentary republic!!

Whatever be the tactics adopted by the CPN(Maoist) the most

objectionable part in the entire matter is its projection of these tactics as a

theoretically developed position which it thinks should be the model for the

revolutions in the 21st century. In the name of fighting against dogmatism

our comrades of CPN(Maoist) are slipping into dangerous territory

From the various interviews of comrade Prachanda and other leaders

of CPN(Maoist) we can clearly see a basic shift in the Maoist position from

the immediate aim of accomplishing the new democratic revolution with

the goal of fighting for socialism and communism to the establishment of a

“multi-party democratic republic” through elections and bringing social

transformation through peaceful means. This goes against the MLM

understanding on state and stage of revolution. We think that this stand of

the CPN(Maoist) and the confusion and deviation that had arisen concerning

the democratic republic is due to its wrong conclusion regarding the present

stage of the revolution in Nepal as explained earlier.

Moreover, as long as the Party wages a consistent struggle against

imperialism and local reactionaries and pursues the line of redistribution of

land and wealth, nationalisation of all comprador, foreign industries, banks

and foreign trade, it is certain to face opposition from the other parliamentary

parties. And if it wants to be part of the parliamentary game it has to abide

by its rules and cannot carry out its anti-feudal, anti-imperialist policies in a
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recognised as part of the game of parliament and can cause obstruction to

every reform which the Maoist party tries to initiate after coming to power

through elections.

Then there will be several institutions like the judiciary, the election

commission, the media, various artistic, cultural and even religious bodies,

non-government organisations, and also human rights organizations some

of which are floated by the ruling classes, and so on. If one slips into the

quagmire of the so-called multiparty democratic republic, one cannot escape

from upholding these so-called independent institutions. Many of these can

become hideouts of the reactionary forces and work for counter-revolution

in diverse subtle ways. One cannot forget the subtle manner in which the

western agencies infiltrated and subverted the societies in East European

countries and even in the former Soviet Union.

***PM: Comrade Prachanda says that the tactics adopted by his party are***

***based on the specificities of the political and military balance in the***

***world as well as particular class, political and power balance in Nepal***

***besides the experiences of the 20th century. What is your Party’s opinion***

***on this?***

**Azad:** It is true that comrade Prachanda in his interview to The Hindu last

February cited the above three factors for his party coming to the decision

on multiparty democracy. In fact, this understanding could be seen in the

CPN(Maoist) even before the said interview. For instance, in the CC meeting

in August 2004, it began to be skeptical about the prospects of victory in a

small country like Nepal when it is confronted by imperialism and there is

no advancement of any strong revolutionary movement.

“In the present context, when along with the restoration of capitalism in

China there is no other socialist state existing, when despite objective

condition turning favorable currently there is no advancement in any strong

revolutionary movement under the leadership of the proletariat, and when

world imperialism is pouncing on people everywhere like an injured tiger, is

it possible for a small country with a specific geo-political compulsion like

Nepal to gain victory to the point of capturing central state through
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today. The answer to this question can only be found in Marxism-Leninism

Maoism and on this depends the future of the Nepalese revolution.”

The same Plenum had also pointed out why the series of tactical steps

like cease-fire, negotiation, political way out etc., were taken up.

“There is no doubt that the imperialist forces are now in preparation for

even more vicious assault as the Nepalese People’s War is in preparation

for strategic offensive from its current position of strategic equilibrium. The

entire complexities, opportunities and challenges of Nepalese revolution are

the manifestations of this objective condition……But, in Nepal, the

development of revolution has reached a very sensitive stage of preparation

for strategic offensive. It is essential to understand that the series of tactical

steps undertaken by the Party such as cease-fire, negotiation, political way

out etc. are based on this strategically favorable and tactically unfavorable

world situation and the condition of strategic equilibrium inside the country.”

It is true that the revolutions everywhere are confronting a tough situation

especially after the setback of China. Tactically speaking, in the present

day world, the enemy forces are quite strong while our subjective forces

are weak. World imperialism has unleashed a massive offensive on the

revolutionary forces, national liberation movements and on the people’s

movements everywhere. But this is only one side of the coin. At the same

time, the objective conditions are quite favourable; imperialism, particularly

US imperialism, is hated by the people everywhere and massive people’s

movements are breaking out against imperialism, particularly US imperialism,

throughout the world. Any revolution in today’s world has to inevitably

face the attacks by the imperialists. And the only way by which we can

fight and teach a lesson to imperialism is by firmly and creatively mobilizing

people for waging people’s war.

If the CPN(Maoist) had a deep and thorough understanding of the

strategy of PPW it would have had adequate clarity on how to grapple with

the situation in the event of external military intervention and transform the

war into a national war and capture state power in the course of the war.

But its desire for quick victory led it to the highly dangerous short cut

method of coming to power through an interim government and participating
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elections to the Constituent assembly. While the continuous successes it

had achieved were the result of the creative application of the strategy of

PPW, it had wrongly synthesized it as a strategy of fusion of PPW with the

armed insurrection. And it expected to achieve final victory within a short

period and announced that it had entered the stage of strategic

counteroffensive in August 2004. But after realizing the difficulties involved

in capturing the towns, especially the capital Kathmandu, and the probable

intervention by the Indian armed forces and the US imperialist forces, and

lacking proper understanding of the strategy of PPW, it opted for the easy

road of a bourgeois democratic republic which would never take the country

towards new democracy or socialism notwithstanding the affirmative

assertions by the CPN(Maoist).

Thus, instead of adhering to the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist understanding

on the imperative need to smash the old state and establish the proletarian

state (the people’s democratic state in the concrete conditions of semi

feudal semi-colonial Nepal) and advance towards the goal of socialism

through the radical transformation of the society and all oppressive class

relations, it chose to reform the existing state through an elected constituent

assembly and a bourgeois democratic republic. It had gone to the extent of

saying:” We are ready to accept the people’s verdict, if they chose

constitutional monarchy and multiparty democracy.” It is indeed a great

tragedy to see the Maoist party finally ending up in these political positions

in spite of having de facto power in most of the countryside.

***PM: Comrade Prachanda says that the line of multiparty democracy***

***applies to the Maoist movement in India too. How does your party see***

***this?***

**Azad:** We saw his comments on this point in his interview with The Hindu

correspondent. It says:

“We believe it applies to them too. We want to debate this. They have

to understand this and go down this route. Both on the question of leadership

and on multiparty democracy, or rather multiparty competition I believe

those who call themselves revolutionaries in India need to think about these
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debate with them on this. If revolutionaries are not going to look at the need

for ideological development, they will not go anywhere.”

Such advice has been coming forth from the various ruling class

parliamentary parties in India since long. The revisionist CPI and CPI(M),

who swear by Marx and Lenin, regularly sermonise through their magazines,

documents and statements, regarding the futility of armed struggle for seizing

state power and achieving revolutionary social transformation. They

desperately try to show how parliamentary multiparty democracy is the

best instrument for achieving this transformation as witnessed in West Bengal

and Kerala. The CPI(ML)-Liberation, in the name of MLM, preaches the

virtues of multiparty democracy and calls all those who do not wish to be

tied to the parliamentary pig-sty as anarchists and adventurists.

It is good that the CPN(Maoist) wants to debate with the Maoists in

India on the question of leadership and multiparty democracy. There have

been interesting discussions and exchange of opinions and experiences

between the leaderships of our two parties on the concept of leadership, on

the question of personality cult and concentration of all power in the hands

of one individual, etc. Our opinion has always been that it is necessary for a

good section of the Party leadership to work among the masses and

concentrate on building class struggle even after the seizure of power in

order to prevent the degeneration in the Party functionaries, officials in the

various state departments, particularly the armed forces, in the various

units in the production sphere, and so on. We must encourage the masses

to criticize the mistakes committed by the party and the party leaders even

in the course of the revolutionary movement prior to the seizure of power.

We must develop collective leadership rather than focusing on any one

individual or delegating revolutionary authority. Dependency on one or few

individuals instead of developing collective leadership and involving the

entire Party membership and the masses in decision-making has been one

of the causes that led to great reversals in Russia and China where, after the

demise of outstanding proletarian leaders like Stalin and Mao, the CPSU

and the CPC turned revisionist so easily.

We agree with comrade Prachanda when he says that “from the lessons
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terms of leadership - where one person doesn't remain the party leader or

the head of state.”

In fact, this had also been one of the major points of debate during the

inner-party struggle in the CPN(Maoist) during 2004-05 when comrade

Bhattarai (Laldhoj), in his Basic Questions for Inner-Party Discussion, raised

questions such as: Is proletarian leadership a centralized expression of

collectivity, or is it a person centered? Does the principal law of dialectics,

viz. one divides into two, apply to the main leadership or not? How does

the system of a single person occupying the top Party, army and the state

posts, and that too for life, solve the question of generating revolutionary

successors and of continuous revolution? Our party, the CPI(Maoist) wish

to conduct a serious debate on these questions and also on the question of

Prachanda Path and on the concept of path, thought and ism.

***PM: Finally, what would you say with regard to the concept of 21st***

***century democracy as proposed by the CPN(MAOIST) led by comrade***

***Prachanda?***

**Azad:** What is new in the concept of 21st century democracy raised by

CPN(Maoist) and how is it qualitatively different from the democracy of

the 20th century? CPN(Maoist) had also claimed that its “decision on multi

party democracy is a strategically, theoretically developed position” which

is even applicable to conditions in India. One knows about bourgeois

democracy and proletarian democracy, that democracy too has a class

character, which in a class-divided society democracy will serve the ruling

class while exercising dictatorship over the rest of the people. In bourgeois

republics the nature of democracy is bourgeois. It is meant to serve the

bourgeoisie while oppressing the vast majority of the people. Its essence is

bourgeois dictatorship. Likewise, in people's democratic republics, the

democracy is meant for all the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist classes while

dictatorship is exercised over the enemies of the people and their agents.

The qualitative difference between different types of democracies lies in

their class character. But when the CPN(Maoist) says that there is a

qualitative difference between the democracy of the 20th and 21st centuries

without any reference to the class character, it is not only unconvincing but
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One reason given is that in the 21st century there has “been

unprecedented development in science and technology, particularly in

electronic communication technology, in the world.” How this unprecedented

development has a bearing on the strategy of the revolutions in the 21st

century or on the nature of democracy in the 21st century is not clear.

It says that “in the field of ideology, the central committee has attempted

to draw a strategic outline of the world revolution based on the analysis of

today’s world situation and mainly the new analysis of globalized imperialism

and proletarian movement and has succeeded to present a totally new concept

in relation to leadership and accomplishing revolution and preventing

counterrevolution” and “in the field of politics” it says, it has made a

“qualitative leap in the concept regarding political and military strategy and

tactic established in the 20th century.”

We are still not clear what is this new concept and qualitative leap

claimed by CPN(Maoist) except for their line of multiparty democracy and

political competition which boils down to competing peacefully with the

various reactionary and revisionist parties for power in a so-called transitional

multiparty democratic republic.

PM: One last question. What is the message you would like to give to

the revolutionary ranks of Nepal, India and the rest of the world?

Azad: First we would seriously request the CPN(Maoist) and its leadership

to reconsider some of its recent positions and learn from the history of past

mistakes. The Nepalese party and people have a great history of struggle

and sacrifice. Over 10,000 have lost their lives in the course of the present

people’s war. We salute these heroic martyrs of the Nepalese and world

revolution. We are confident that the great Nepalese people will advance

the revolution forward facing the numerous twists and turns in the movement.

There is no doubt that revolution today is no simple task; the path will be

zig-zag.

We also call on the people of India to lend full support to the Nepalese

revolution. But while doing so it is also the duty of the Indian and world

proletariat to render friendly suggestions to their comrades in Nepal. After

all, the interests of the Nepalese revolution are very much in the interests of
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revolution. The revolutionary people of India are ready for any sacrifice in

support of the Nepalese revolution. We are confident that we will march

forward, together, against the obnoxious system of world imperialism and

its local semi-feudal base.

***PM: We, on behalf of the People’s March wish to thank you for the***

***interview on this so crucial issue in a neighbouring country.***

**Azad:** Thank You